

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 12, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-11, 19-26 and 28-30 are pending in the present Application. Claims 2, 12-18, 27 were previously canceled, and Claims 1, 19, 23 and 26 have been amended, leaving Claims 1, 3-11, 19-26 and 28-30 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Support for the amendments can be found on at least page 9, lines 6-9, lines 19-21, page 10, lines 20-24, and page 11, lines 1-9. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

First Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-8, 11, and 19-26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wu (US 6,275,575) in view of Hogan et al. (US 5,483,587) further in view of Culbreth et al. (US 5,953,393). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that the current amendment renders the rejection moot.

Specifically, Wu in view of Hogan further in view of Culbreth does not teach or other wise make obvious the claim recitations:

a web interface configured to receive a confirmation screen whereby the user can make corrections related to the future audio conference request;

wherein the future audio conference request includes a meeting host phone number, and at least one additional future audio conference call party number,

wherein the call control engine is configured to reject the future audio conference request in response to a passing of the future audio conference;

wherein, if the host is unavailable the call control engine disconnects and at least one of removes the audio conference information associated with the future audio conference request from the conference call database, and retries the host before canceling the conference call;

and

wherein the information associated with the future audio conference request is removed from the conference call database in response to the bridging facility bridging the audio connections between the host party and the at least one participant.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Wu in view of Hogan further in view of Culbreth do not teach or otherwise make obvious Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 19-26 and 28, either individually or in combination.

For at least the above reasons, Claims 1, 19, 23 and 26 are patentable over Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth. Claims 3-8, 11 and 25 depend from Claim 1, Claims 20-22 depend upon Claim 19, Claim 24 depends upon Claim 23, and Claim 28 depends upon Claim 26, and is patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth for at least the reasons advanced with reference to Claims 1, 19, 23 and 26.

Second Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wu (US 6,275,575) in view of Hogan et al. (US 5,483,587) and Culbreth et al. (US 5,953,393) further in view of Roy (US 6,697,341). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth further in view of Roy do not teach or otherwise make obvious Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 19-26 and 28, either individually or in combination.

Roy fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu and Hogan and Culbreth as discussed above with reference to Claim 1. Claims 9 and 10 depend from Claim 1 and are

patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth in view of Roy for at least the reasons advanced with respect to Claim 1.

Third Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wu (US 6,275,575) in view of Hogan et al. (US 5,483,587) and Culbreth et al. (US 5,953,393) further in view of Buskirk, Jr. (US 6,178,183). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth further in view of Buskirk, Jr. do not teach or otherwise make obvious Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 19-26 and 28, either individually or in combination.

Buskirk, Jr., fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu and Hogan and Culbreth as discussed above with reference to Claim 26. Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 26 and are patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth in view of Buskirk, Jr. for at least the reasons advanced with respect to Claim 26.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Attorney for Applicants via telephone should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present response.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicant. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested. If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Greg O'Bradovich
Registration No. 42,945
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (404) 607-9991
Facsimile (404) 607-9981
Customer No. 36192

Date: September 12, 2007